REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005. Applicant notes with appreciation the fact that the final rejection was withdrawn (see Advisory Action dated March 17, 2005).

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 17 and 18 contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 now stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatetnable over Tsuzuki in view of Suzuki, Bigio and Feasey (newly cited). This 4-way Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Feasey is not properly combinable with the other cited art. *First*, Feasey does not relate to monitoring color of an LCD. Feasey's display is not an LCD; instead, in Feasey three electron guns scan across a phosphor-coated screen to make up a display as stated at col. 3, lines 43-48. Second, Feasey's system relates to calibrating color settings to match with a printed image on paper, wherein the calibrating is performed so as to permit proper adjustment of gamma rays for R, G and B color in the electron-gun display. The other cited art is entirely unrelated to Feasey in each of these two respects. While Suzuki for example relates to a system for performing brightness correction in an LCD, Feasey has nothing to do with this. Feasey does not even monitor an LCD. Instead, Feasey uses three electron guns to scan across a phosphor-coated screen (not an LCD) to make up a display as explained at col. 3, lines 43-48. Moreover, the goal of Feasey's calibration system is to allow for proper adjustment of gamma rays for R, G and B color in the electron-gun display (col. 12, lines 27-30). There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Feasey of monitoring LCD pixel outputs for any reason, let alone in order to control backlight operation. Thus, there is no motivation or suggestion in the art of record for

using the gamma ray adjustment system of Feasey in the device of Suzuki or the like. One of ordinary skill in the art would never have used Feasey's technique for calibrating electron gun displays in the device of Suzuki or the like because such devices and system are entirely unrelated to these types of displays. The arts are unrelated. Hindsight is not permitted.

Furthermore, in an LCD individual pixels have different addresses. In contrast, Feasey addresses a CRT to which the notion of pixels does not apply. That is, while in an LCD a particular pixel can be uniquely specified with an address, in a CRT because of the influence of noise or the like a particular x-y position on the screen cannot be determined uniquely with an address. Thus, while in an LCD it is possible to keep monitoring the state of a particular pixel, in a CRT this is impossible. Accordingly, it can be seen that Feasey is entirely unrelated to the invention of claim 1 and also to the other art cited in the 4-way Section 103(a) rejection. The alleged combination would not have been made in view of the different arts involved, and is incorrect.

Since Feasey is not combinable with the other art, the Section 103(a) rejections are incorrect as to all claims.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100